nature in the factory, even if the work be not of a hazardous nature the labourer is within the definition and entitled to protection. It does not matter whether the work is of a hazardous or non-hazardous nature, because the labourer fulfils only one and not both conditions.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The idea of the honourable member might be to extend the scope of the Bill by including workmen whose occupation will be of a casual nature. Those persons whose employment is of a casual nature are obviously excluded under clause (n), first portion. The member wants to include people whose employment is of a casual nature provided the employment will be hazardous. That is the idea.

MR. PUTHUPALLY S. KRISHNA PILLAI: Sir, my point is that all casual labourers are protected provided their work relates to the trade or business of the employer. The amendment looks as if the clause excludes all casual workers. Casual workers are excluded only if the employ ment is for a non-trade or non-business purpose of the employer.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The House will now adjourn and re-assemble at 2.

The Assembly adjourned for lunch at 1 p. m. and re-assembled at 2 p. m. the President presiding.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. C. V. Chandrasekharan took the oath and signed the rolls.

LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS.—(*contd.*)

THE TRAVANCORE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION BILL—(*contd.*)

MR. PUTHUPALLY S. KRISHNA PILLAI: Sir, I was pointing out how the clause as it stands in the Bill is more beneficial to the labourer than it would be if amended as now proposed. Clause 2 (n) says

> "(n) 'workman' means any person (other than a person whose employment is of a casual nature and who is employed otherwise than for the purposes of the employer's trade or business).....

In order that a labourer may not come within the definition of the term 'workman', two conditions have to be fulfilled, namely, (1) the employment should be of a casual nature, and (2) the employment must be for a purpose other than the employer's trade or business. In other words, if the employment, whether casual or not casual, is for purposes of the employer's trade or business, the employee will be a workman under the definition. Under the definition as it stands, whether the employ. ment is hazardous or not, the workman will get the benefit of this legi . lation if the work is for the purpose of the employer's trade or business

The only class of servants that will be excluded from that clause is casual servants engaged for any domestic work. I hope it is not the intension of the mover that such workmen also should be included. Even if there is any such object behind this motion, I think that the interpolation of Sub-clause (iii) will make it redundant.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly